

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-8 are pending in the present application.

The objection to the specification is noted. Applicant respectfully submits that there is proper antecedent basis in the specification for the reflex amplification circuit recited in claim 3. The Examiner's attention is directed to page 6, lines 17-19 of the specification wherein the use of a reflex amplification circuit is described. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

In any event, Applicant has amended the specification paragraph at page 20, line 11 to state that amplification circuits AMPa and AMPb are "reflex amplification circuits". No new matter has been added. Approval of the amendment to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,531,934 to Mikami et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claims 1 and 7 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a resonator having an opening with a plurality of electrode patterns extended inwardly from the opening, and "wherein a direction of a current flowing along one edge of each of said electrode patterns is opposite to a direction of a current flowing along an opposite edge thereof." Support for this amendment can be found at page 9, lines 10-15 of the specification.

While Mikami et al. discloses an electrode having an opening with a plurality of electrodes projecting inwardly from the opening, these inwardly projecting electrodes are shaped and arranged so as to move the resonance frequency of an undesired mode away from the resonance frequency of a TE_{010} mode. See col. 5, line 60 through col. 6, line 5.

There is nothing within Mikami et al., however, which teaches or even remotely suggests that the direction of the current flowing along one edge of the inwardly projecting electrodes is opposite in direction to the current flowing along the other opposite edge thereof. Therefore, Mikami et al. neither teaches nor suggests each and every limitation as defined in independent claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 7 patentably distinguish over the art of record.

Claims 2-6 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and include all of the limitations found therein. Claim 8 depends directly from independent claim 7 and include all of the limitations found therein. Each of these dependent claims include additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the claims from which they depend, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record. Accordingly, claims 2-6 and 8 are likewise patentable.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of the amendments to the specification, favorable consideration of the amendments to claims 1 and 7, and allowance of the present application with claims 1-8 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: January 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Richard LaCava

Richard LaCava

Registration No.: 41,135

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant